UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,870	12/31/2003	Shelly D. Farnham	MS1-1914US	6293

22801 7590 10/16/2007	**EXAMINER**
LEE & HAYES PLLC	RAYYAN, SUSAN F
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500	
SPOKANE, WA 99201	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 August 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-7, 9, 10 and 12-30_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-7, 9, 10 and 12-30_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed August 8, 2007 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

Applicant argues prior art of record does not disclose identifying components

associated with a first endpoint and with a second end point. Applicant finds Isaacs

teaches this at column 2, lines 41-50, as identify contacts (components.).

Applicant argues prior art of record does not disclose determining whether any of the

identified components are associated with booth the first end point and the second end

point. Examiner finds Isaacs teaches this limitation at column 1, lines 66-column 2, line

1, as identify priority to one another and column 5, lines 50-60.

Applicant argues prior art of record does not disclose wherein displaying

relationships includes displaying a social context associated with the first end point and

displaying a social context associated with the second end point . Nevin does·wherein

displaying relationships includes displaying a social context associated with the first end

point and displaying a social context associated with the second end point (Figure 4,as

name represents a social context).

Applicant argues Martino does not teach display a second end point in a social

network. Examiner finds Martino teaches this limitation at (Figure 5, reference number

I8).

DETAILED ACTION

2.   Claims 8,11 are canceled. Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-30 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 16,18,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by

US Patent Number 6,486,898 issued Jacquelyn Martino ("Martino")

As per claim 16 Martino anticipates:

displaying a first end point (Figure 5, reference number 17);

displaying components associated with the first end point(Figure 5, reference number

12);

displaying a second end point(Figure 5, reference number 18);

displaying components associated with the second end point(Figure 5, reference

number 15);

displaying a common component associated with the first end point and the second end

point(Figure 5, reference number 13);

displaying a link between the common component and the first end point(Figure 5,

reference number L27);

and displaying a link between the common component and the second end point(Figure

5, reference number L28).

determining a path strength associated with the common component by, at least in

part,:

determining a first link strength for the link between the common component and the

first end point, determining a second link strength for the link between the common

component and the second end point, and calculating the path strength based at least

in part on the first link strength and the second link strength (see Figure 5, and column

4, lines 17-40).

As per claim 18, same as claim arguments above and Martino anticipates:

displaying a second common component associated with the first end point and the

second end point (Figure 5, reference number I6);

displaying a link between the second common component and the first end point(Figure

5, reference number L26,L12,L27).

and displaying a link between the second common component and the second end

point(Figure 5, reference number L56,L58).

Claim 22 is rejected based on the same arguments as claim 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-15,29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,832,245 issued to Ellen Isaacs et al

("Isaacs") and by US Patent Number 6,486,898 issued Jacquelyn Martino

("Martino") and of US Publication Number 2005/0086238 issued to Rocky Harry W.

Nevin III ("Nevin").

As per claim 1 Isaacs teaches:

identifying components associated with a first end point in an environment (column 2,

lines 41-50, as identify contacts (components)) ;

identifying components associated with a second end point in the environment (column

2, lines 41-50, as identify contacts (components));

determining whether any of the identified components are associated with both the first

end point and the second end point (column 1, lines 66-column 2, line 1, as identify

priority to one another and column 5, lines 50-60);

identifying relationships between the first end point, the second end point, and any

components associated with both the first end point and the second end point (column

2, lines 60-65, as determine contact id and relationships between).

Isaacs does not explicitly teach displaying relationships by , in part, displaying ...

first end point ... and the second end point. Martino does teach displaying relationships

by , in part, displaying ... first end point ... and the second end point (See Figure 5:

Reference Numbers I7, I2 endpoints) to facilitate a recognition of the relationship among

information items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to modify Isaac with displaying relationships by , in part,

displaying ... first end point ... and the second end point to facilitate a recognition of the

relationship among information items as described by Martino (column 2, line 65-column

3, line 2).

Isaacs and Martino do not explicitly teach displaying relationships includes

displaying a social context associated with the first end point and displaying a social

context associated with the second end point . Nevin does wherein displaying

relationships includes displaying a social context associated with the first end point and

displaying a social context associated with the second end point (Figure 4,as name

represents a social context). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention was made to modify Isaac further in view of Martino with

displaying relationships includes displaying a social context associated with the first end

point and displaying a social context associated with the second end to give the user

easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the

relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph 172, lines 3-5).

As per claim 2, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs teaches:

wherein the environment is a social environment (column 1, lines 57-63, as contacts

may be related to social networks such as personal life and workplace).

As per claim 3, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs teaches:

further comprising receiving a request to identify relationships between the first end

point and the second end point (column 2, lines 45-49 and column 3, lines 9-11, as

provide contact network to the user).

As per claim 4, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches:

wherein determining whether any of the identified components are associated with both

the first end point and the second end point includes determining a path strength for

each path between the first end point and the second end point (column 4, lines 17-35,

as location to indicate a relational distance from a reference node).

As per claim 5, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches:

determining a path strength for each path between the first end point and the second

end point and ranking the paths between the first end point and the second end point

based on path strength (column 5, lines 7-16 as nodes are ordered left-to-right based

on degree of separation).

As per claim 6, same as claim arguments above and Nevin teaches:

ignoring paths having a path strength below a predetermined threshold(at paragraph 73,

as presenting data related to a threshold).

As per claim 7, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches:

wherein identifying relationships includes identifying only the top ranked paths between

the first end point and the second end point (See Figure 5).

As per claim 9, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs teaches:

wherein displaying relationships includes displaying information regarding at least one

component (Figure 1, Reference Number 80: Content Display and column 3, lines 5-15

as listing of contacts).

As per claim 10, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs teaches:

wherein displaying relationships includes displaying information regarding at least one

link between components(Figure 1, Reference Number 80: Content Display and column

3, lines 5-15 as listing of contacts).

As per claim 12, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches:

wherein displaying relationships includes: displaying the first end point and

displaying the second end point; and displaying at least one common component

associated with the first end point and the second end point (See Figure 5, display

endpoints and common components).

As per claim 13, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches:

displaying a common component associated with the first end point and the second end

point displaying at least one link between the common component and the first end

point and displaying at least one link between the common component and the second

end point. (See Figure 5, display endpoints, common components, Links).

As per claim 14, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches:

displaying the first end point, displaying the second end point, displaying components

associated with the first end point and displaying components associated with the

second end point (Figure 5, reference number I7), displaying the second end point

(Figure 5, reference number I8) displaying components associated with the first end

point (Figure 5, reference number I2) and displaying components associated with the

second end point (Figure 5, reference number I5).

Claim 15 is rejected based on the same arguments as claim 1.

As per claim 29, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches;

wherein the path strength is based at least in part on one or more link strengths,

wherein individual link strengths are associated with a link between one or both of:

the first end point and an identified component associated with both the

first end point and the second end point or the second end point and an identified

component associated with both the first end point and the second end point (see

Figure 5, and column 4, lines 17-40).

As per claim 30, same as claim arguments above and Isaacs teaches:

wherein one or both of identifying components associated with a first end point in an

environment and identifying components associated with a second end point in the

environment are performed at last in part by analyzing an organizational chart (column

2, lines 45-59, as grouping of colleges, a company, an organization).

Claims 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over US Patent Number 6,486,898 issued Jacquelyn Martino ("Martino") and US

Publication Number 2005/0086238 issued to Rocky Harry W. Nevin III ("Nevin").

As per claim 23, Martino teaches:

display a first end point in a social network (Figure 5, reference number I7);

display a second end point in a social network(Figure 5, reference number I8);

identify a common component associated with the first end point and the second end

point(Figure 5, reference number I3);

display the common component associated with the first end point (Figure 5, reference

number I2)and the second end point(Figure 5, reference number L27);

display a link between the common component and the first end point(Figure 5,

reference number L27);

and display a link between the common component and the second end point(Figure 5,

reference number L28).

Martino does not explicitly teach displaying ... a social context associated with

the ... end point. Nevin does teach displaying ... a social context associated with the ...

end point (Figure 4,as name represents a social context). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Isaac

further in view of Martino with displaying ... a social context associated with the ... end

point to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts

of data and the relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph 172,

lines 3-5).

As per claim 24, same as claim arguments above and Nevin teaches:

wherein the one or more processors further determine a path strength associated with

the common component and prevent display of the common component if the path

strength is below a threshold (at paragraph 73, as presenting data related to a

threshold).

As per claim 25, same as claim arguments above and Nevin teaches:

wherein the one or more processors further display a second link between the common

component and the first end point (at paragraph 199 and Figure 1, as nodes linked

together more than once) .

As per claim 26, same as claim arguments above and Nevin teaches:

wherein the one or more processors further display a second link between the common

component and the first end point and display a second link between the common

component and the second end point (at paragraph 199 and Figure 1, as nodes linked

together more than once).

As per claim 27, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches:

wherein the one or more processors further identify a second common component

associated with the first end point and the second end point(Figure 5, reference number

I6).

As per claim 28, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches:

wherein the one or more processors further display the second common component

associated with the first end point and the second end point(Figure 5, reference number

I6).

Claims 17,19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Martino et al as applied to claims 16,23 above, and further in view of US

Publication Number 2005/0086238 issued to Rocky Harry W. Nevin III ("Nevin").

As per claim 17, same as claim arguments above and Martino does not explicitly teach

teaches determining a path strength associated with the common component and

and preventing the display of the common component if the path strength is below a

threshold. Nevin does teach this limitation (at paragraph 73, as presenting data related

to a threshold) to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large

amounts of data and the relationships between them. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martino

with determining a path strength associated with the common component and

preventing the display of the common component if the path strength is below a

threshold to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large

amounts of data and the relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph

172, lines 3-5).

As per claim 19, same as claim arguments above and Martino does not explicitly teach

displaying a second link between the common component and the first end point. Nevin

does teach this limitation (at paragraph 199 and Figure 1, as nodes linked together

more than once) to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present

large amounts of data and the relationships between them. . It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Martino with displaying a second link between the common component and the first end

point to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts

of data and the relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph 172,

lines 3-5).

As per claim 20, same as claim arguments above and Martino teaches:

determining a strongest link between the common component and the first end point

and highlighting the strongest link between the common component and the first end

point (column 6, lines 60-61, highlighting).

As per claim 21, same as claim arguments above and Martino does not explicitly teach displaying a second link between the common component and the first endpoint and displaying a second link between the common component and the second end point. Nevin does teach this limitation (at paragraph 199 and Figure 1, as nodes linked together more than once) to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Martino with displaying a second link between the common component and the first endpoint and displaying a second link between the common component and the second end point to give the user easier access to relevant data and visually present large amounts of data and the relationships between them as described by Nevin (paragraph 172, lines 3-5).

Conclusion

5.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Susan F. Rayyan whose telephone number is 571-272-

1675. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-4:00.

.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Susan Rayyan

October 10, 2007

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100